

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/824,449 First Named Applicant: Kendall G. Young
 Examiner: Robert M. Timblin Art Unit: 2167 Status of Application: Non-Final

Tentative Participants:

(1) Denver S. Bisignano (2) _____
 (3) _____ (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: November 13, 2009 Proposed Time: 3:00p.m. EST (AM/PM)

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>Rej.</u>	<u>1-5,8,10-13,</u>	<u>Art Goodwin</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	<u>15-16</u>	<u>Pakhomov</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	<u>Barney</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	<u>Kravets</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☐ Continuation Sheet Attached

☒ Proposed Amendment or Arguments Attached

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

See attached

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

/denver s. bisignano/

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Denver S. Bisignano

Examiner/SPE Signature

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

60,693

Registration Number, if applicable

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Brief Description of Arguments

Applicants respectfully submit that neither of the cited patent documents, alone nor in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest all featured method steps/operations or elements of the featured dynamic reference repository system.

For example, Applicants note that Goodwin, the primary reference, describes a system and method for synchronizing profile data based on one or more changes in relationship information (i.e., affinity) between individuals and subject matter/knowledge data typically via use of metadata information associated with stored content. Goodwin further describes that its method and system include provisions for mapping information stored in a data repository to a user having an affinity to such information, for identifying changes in affinities of one or more persons to the information and synchronizing the changes with profile data associated with the one or more persons, and for allowing a user to search knowledge data based on the user affinity to the information. Goodwin also describes that its system can establish a training set (special subset of data repositories) used to build the first draft of a knowledge map and a spider capable of accessing one or more databases to extract the necessary relationship information between individuals and subject matter.

Notably, although Goodwin was introduced as teaching mapping an enterprise technical requirement received from a procuring entity, the threshold for affinities described in col. 6, line 10, is not a enterprise technical requirement, is not being mapped, and is not received from a procuring entity. Also, the taxonomist (editor), col. 5, lines 15-16, and administrator, col. 6, line 10, would not be considered a procuring entity. Further, although introduced as teaching "dynamically updating a knowledge map between enterprise requirements, enterprise technology, subject matter expert expertise, and enterprise capabilities responsive to the updated identified enterprise requirements, updated identified enterprise technologies, and updated identified enterprise subject matter expert expertise," the Goodwin Knowledge Map (taxonomy) is instead a map of the relationship between undefined organizational resources, particularly, a hierarchal representation of content organized by a builder process. As such, the existence of the Goodwin does not provide such detailed teaching. Still further, although introduced as providing notice of identified updates made to existing information resources via providing different search results, such would not be a notification to the user of any specific identified updates to the information sources. Nor does Goodwin teach capability assessments directed to the enterprise or enterprise subject matter inputs. People data source 106 appears to only list people for establishing affinities and not subject matter expert inputs (based on operational experiments, systems experiments, and technical experience) used as a data source for satisfying desired enterprise capabilities. Still further, although introduced as teaching generating a subject matter expert request for information required to produce pertinent inputs to the dynamic reference repository, the providing of a notification of proposed affinity information between a specific person and a document, at best, would be considered a request for inputs for affinity mapping, and not for subject matter expertise to produce inputs to populate a dynamic reference repository. Still further, although introduced as teaching running periodic prioritized customizable agent searches prioritized to specific reference materials (the Goodwin training set), nothing indicates that such searches of the training set "used to build a first draft of a knowledge map" would be periodically run to discover inputs for a dynamic reference repository. Still further, although introduced as teaching integrating retrieve documents into XML format, no description is provided with respect to saving such documents collectively into a dynamic reference repository containing only documents having such format.

Pakhomov, the second primary reference, describes a system and method for electronically generating training data (feature vectors) used in conjunction with the maximum entropy statistical technique or other probabilistic models for abbreviation and acronym normalization in medical or other kinds of texts. Pakhomov further describes utilizing a corpus of clinical notes or other health records in which the expansions of the abbreviations to be trained are found.

Notably, although Pakhomov was introduced as teaching identifying enterprise technology requirements, the cardiology, rheumatology, and endocrinology described in col. 4, lines 40-49, are a type of record and not an enterprise technology requirement(s) identified based on a plurality of desired enterprise capabilities to enable identifying and populating a dynamic reference repository with a plurality of pertinent inputs required to support the desired enterprise capabilities. Pakhomov was also introduced as teaching dynamically updating identified enterprise technologies responsive to receiving updates to certain information sources. Pakhomov, however, provides no description of identifying enterprise technologies [requirements] needed to support such certain enterprise capabilities nor updating such technologies [requirements]. Pakhomov was further introduced as performing an automated recognition of a global replacement of a word. Pakhomov, however, describes developing vectors used to associate an acronym with the expanded version of the acronym. Nothing is described of recognizing any wholesale replacement of the expanded version with a different word/phrase or of the wholesale replacement of the associated acronym with a different acronym, based on contextual usage.

Barney describes a job analysis system and method of operating a computer to perform a job analysis. Barney further describes providing a notification to a job analysis subject matter expert of a network address of a preliminary survey for completion by the subject matter expert.

Notably, although Barney was introduced as teaching providing an online communication to initiate contact with a subject matter expert to conduct a subject matter expert review or assessment of a technology or capability, only a job analysis survey is made available. Nothing indicates that the survey covers an enterprise technology or capability assessments or that the website having the link to the survey is configured to be in the form of an interactive enterprise website associated with a dynamic reference repository.

Kravets describes a search data processor tool used with a search engine to provide for refining search queries through the selective modification of search terms, and repackaging of search results.

Notably, although Kravetz was introduced as teaching dynamically modifying a custom user search request used to update a dynamic reference repository responsive to past customizable agent usage, search habits of the user, and characteristics of the particular user, and was introduced as teaching updating a next search based on return of undesired information, the cited passages instead describe a simple search focus repackaging the same search results within a simple user search, and not an update of the search used to populate a dynamic reference repository based on selective rejection of certain results.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that neither of the cited patent documents, alone or in combination, disclose, teach, nor suggest the various featured steps/operations or and reference repository system. Nevertheless, in order to expedite prosecution of the application, Applicants respectfully plan to discuss some proposed claim amendments with respect to the cited patent documents.